DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 128 305 TM 005 507

AUTHOR	Bergeth, Robert L.
TITLE	The High Potential Program in the Minneapolis Schools: An Evaluation.
INSTITUTION	Minneapolis Public Schools, Minn. Dept. of Research and Evaluation.
REPORT NO	C-74-45
PUB DATE	Aug 75
NOTE	37p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Creative Writing; Elementary School Mathematics; Elementary School Science; *Enrichment Programs; *Gifted; *Intermediate Grades; Modern Language Curriculum; Parent Attitudes; Participant Satisfaction; *Program Evaluation; Social Studies; Student Attitudes; Student Characteristics; Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS	*High Potential Program; Minneapolis Minnesota Public Schools; Minnesota (Minneapolis)

ABSTRACT

The Minneapolis Public Schools High Potential Program for gifted elementary children in grades four through six began December 2, 1974. Twenty-one schools and approximately 353 students participated. Programs in math, science, social studies-modern language, and creative writing were offered. The purpose of the program was to offer a challenging, enrichment experience for high ability students. Students were challenged to learn subject matter in much greater depth and breadth than their regular classroom experience and also were exposed to new ideas and concepts. A specialist in each of the subject areas provided the instruction. The High Potential Program was very successful according to the views of high potential students, parents of students, and teachers of students. (Author/BW)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED128385

Minneapolis Public Schools

THE HIGH POTENTIAL PROGRAM IN THE MINNEAPOLIS SCHOOLS: AN EVALUATION

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Robert L. Bergeth, Ph.D.
Research Specialist

Ideas expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect the official position of the Minneapolis Public School Administration nor the Minneapolis School Board.

TM005 507

C-74-45
August 1975

Research and Evaluation Department
Planning and Support Services Division
807 Northeast Broadway
Minneapolis, MN 55413

Minneapolis Board of Education
W. Harry Davis, Chairman

Richard F. Allen Marilyn A. Borea Carol R. Lind
John M. Mason Phillip A. Olson Jane A. Starr

Interim Superintendent
Donald D. Bevis

Special School District No. 1

MINNEAPOLIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS

MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA

An Equal Opportunity Employer

Minneapolis Public Schools

THE HIGH POTENTIAL PROGRAM IN THE MINNEAPOLIS SCHOOLS: AN EVALUATION

Summary

See Page

The Minneapolis Public Schools High Potential Program for gifted elementary children in grades 4-6 began December 2, 1974. Twenty-one schools and approximately 353 students participated. Programs in math, science, social studies-modern language, and creative writing were offered. The program was funded by the Office of Instruction, Minneapolis Schools. 1

The purpose of the program was to offer a challenging, enrichment experience for high ability students. Students were challenged to learn subject matter in much greater depth and breadth than their regular classroom experience and also were exposed to new ideas and concepts. A specialist in each of the subject areas provided the instruction. 1

How successful was the High Potential Program? Very successful according to the views of high potential students, parents of students and teachers of students. That is the main finding of a recent survey of students, parents and teachers. 9-21

Here are some additional findings from the evaluation conducted by the Minneapolis Public Schools Research Department:

1. Sixty-one percent of the students said they benefited a great deal and only 4% said they received no benefit. Most teachers (91%) thought their students benefited and only 3% indicated the program was of little benefit. Practically all of the parents (99%) said their children benefited. 9,14,21
2. Most of the students (90%) enjoyed the program. 9
3. Seventy-three percent of the students felt their interest in the subject studied was greater because of the program. Most of the teachers (86%) felt that the students' interest increased as a result of the program. 11,14
4. Nearly all of the parents liked the program (99%) and most would like to see it continued (98%). Most students (80%) would like it to continue and nearly all the teachers (91%) recommend the continuance of the program. 11,14,21
5. Practically all the teachers (95%) indicated there was a need for special high potential programs outside their classroom. Most of the teachers (81%) felt they could not do as good a job with the students as the teachers in the High Potential Program could. 14
6. Fifty percent of the teachers felt their students had gained in subject matter skills. Eighty percent of the teachers who had students in the science program felt their students had gained in subject matter skills; math was second with 56%, then social studies (47%) and creative writing (35%). 14
7. The High Potential Program was liked better by the students than their comparable regular classroom subject. 12

A number of recommendations are given. 25

Table of Contents

	Page
Summary	ii
Listing of Tables	iv
Overview	1
What Kinds of Programs Were Offered? What Schools and How Many Students Were Involved?	1
How Was The Program Evaluated?	3
Student Description, Selection and Ability to Make up Missed Classwork	3
How Successful Was The High Potential Program According to Student Views?	5
How Successful Was The High Potential Program According to Teacher Views?	12
How Successful Was The High Potential Program According to Parent Views?	19
Summary and Recommendations	23
APPENDIX	
Student Questionnaire	26
Teacher High Potential Program Questionnaire	28
High Potential Parent Telephone Interview Form	30

List of Tables

Table		Page
1	Description of High Potential Students.	4
2	Student Self Concept.	6
3	Subjects Most Frequently Missed By Students While Attending High Potential Programs	8
4	What Do The High Potential Students Think About the Program?.	10
5	How Do The Students Compare Their High Potential Program With Their Regular Class? . .	13
6	Did The Students Share Anything They Liked About the Program With Their Friends, Teachers and Class?.	15
7	How Successful Was The Program According to Teacher Views?	16-17
8	Which High Potential Class Schedule Do Teachers Prefer?	20

Minneapolis Public Schools

THE HIGH POTENTIAL PROGRAM IN THE MINNEAPOLIS SCHOOLS: AN EVALUATION

The Minneapolis Public Schools High Potential Program for gifted elementary children in grades 4-6 began December 2, 1974. Twenty-one schools and approximately 353 students participated. Programs in math, science, social studies-modern language, and creative writing were offered. The program was funded by the Office of Instruction, Minneapolis Schools.

The purpose of the program was to offer a challenging, enrichment experience for high ability students. Students were challenged to learn subject matter in much greater depth and breadth than their regular classroom experience and also were exposed to new ideas and concepts. A specialist in each of the subject areas provided the instruction.

Instruction was offered in each of the 21 schools. Thus, students merely walked from their regular classroom to another room in the same building which was set up specifically for the High Potential Program.

This report details the results of that program. Answers are provided for the following questions:

1. What programs were offered?
2. What were the chief characteristics of the students?
3. How were the students selected?
4. How successful were the programs?
5. What did teachers, students, and parents think about the program?

WHAT KINDS OF PROGRAMS WERE OFFERED? WHAT SCHOOLS AND HOW MANY STUDENTS WERE INVOLVED?

Creative Writing

Creative writing was offered to students in Burroughs, Kenny, Lake Harriet, Lowry and Lyndale. Approximately 68 students participated. In each school about 10 students received instruction for six weeks, four times a week. Stan Kiesel was the creative writing teacher.

The course's objectives were to expose children to contemporary poetry and encourage imaginative writing through the use of various artistic enrichment experiences. Some of these experiences included guest artists and visits to interesting areas. The children were encouraged to produce a book of original writing and art and were offered opportunities to write on many different subjects.

Social Studies--Modern Languages

Social studies--modern language was offered to students in eight schools, namely: Fulton, Lincoln, Windom, Howe, Longfellow, Webster, Bremer, and Lind. Approximately 176 students participated in the program. Instruction was provided by Dee Ransom four times a week for six weeks.

The mode of instruction was primarily inquiry. Topics such as the following were explored:

- What is culture?
- What is the Hispanic World?
- What do we know about Early man in the Hispanic World?
- How did the Pre-Columbian civilization develop?
- What influence did conquistadors have on the culture of Latin America?
- What are some similarities/differences in the nations of Latin America today and what is the basis for such contrast?
- What are the influences that the Hispanic World has had on the life of the people of the United States?

Science

Science was provided to approximately 60 students in four schools twice a week for twelve weeks by Les Retzer. The schools were Audubon, Seward, Barton and Hamilton.

The science program for the high potential students was project oriented. The mode of instruction was inquiry and individual and group projects were stressed. Investigation centered on the development of broad topics such as, "Do all living organisms require food?" General discussions were held on each topic and each student was required to conduct two or three experiments related to the main topic and then to discuss his findings with the class. The students also had optional experiments they could work on and could substitute experiments of their own design in lieu of the required and optional experiments. Field trips, resource people and films were also included.

Mathematics

Math was offered to approximately 49 students in four schools one-half day a week for twenty-four weeks. Sally Sloan was the instructor. The schools were: Anwatin, Ericsson, Shingle Creek and Tuttle.

The major program activities were computer related and enriched mathematics.

Enriched mathematics aimed at developing a lively interest in math and a deeper understanding of the mathematics the student already had. Students also had the opportunity to write computer programs to solve problems.

HOW WAS THE PROGRAM EVALUATED?

The overriding concern of this study was to answer the following question: How successful was the High Potential Program?

To answer this question, three questionnaires were developed and administered to parents of the students, the students themselves, and teachers who had students in the program (see Appendix for copies of questionnaires).

Questionnaires were mailed April 8, 1975 to all teachers who had students in the program (120). Ninety anonymous questionnaires were returned (75% return rate) after one follow-up request was made. Four schools had not been involved in the program long enough to provide accurate data, and therefore, were excluded from the study (Bremer, Lind, Shingle Creek and Tuttle).

All students who participated in the program were given a student questionnaire the week of April 19-23. Two members of the Research Department gave the questionnaires to the students at each school. Eighty-eight percent (247) were usable questionnaires. Those who were absent did not receive a questionnaire. All responses were anonymous.

A random sample of 72 parents from 15 schools were interviewed on the telephone, April 8 to April 16. A member of the Research Department conducted the interview by telephone according to the interview schedule listed in the Appendix. Between four and five parents from each school were randomly selected for the interview. In most cases (90%), it was the mother who was interviewed because she was the person who was home when the call was made.

STUDENT DESCRIPTION, SELECTION AND ABILITY TO MAKE-UP MISSED CLASSWORK

Describe the Student Participants

A profile of the 247 high potential students presented in Table I, indicates that 54% of those responding to the questionnaire were boys and 92% were white; physical education was their favorite subject and their favorite activity was being with friends. Sixth graders comprised the largest group (40%), then fifth grade (34%), and fourth grade (25%). Two times as many boys as girls were enrolled in science.

Table 1

Description of High Potential Students[a]

Item	Rating	All Students (N=247)	Creative Writing (N=59)	Social Studies (N=114)	Math (N=44)	Science (N=30)
I am:	A boy	54%	44%	54%	59%	67%
	A girl	46	56	46	41	33
I am in:	Fourth grade	25	17	27	25	36
	Fifth grade	34	36	35	34	27
	Sixth grade	40	47	38	41	37
My race is:	Black	4	3	5	5	3
	White	92	93	92	93	90
	Other	3	3	3	2	7
Which would you rather do:	Be with friends	38	53	33	35	33
	Go to school	23	10	24	30	30
	Read a book	18	19	20	9	20
	Play	10	7	10	14	13
	Watch television	8	5	9	12	3
	Be by yourself	3	5	4	0	0
Do you like to take tests?	Yes	65	63	68	60	66
	No	35	37	32	40	34
Do you like math?	Yes	80	76	76	100	76
	No	20	24	24	0	24
Do you like science?	Yes	88	83	90	86	100
	No	12	17	10	14	0
Do you like to write?	Yes	82	98	77	77	76
	No	18	2	23	23	24
Do you like to read	Yes	94	98	95	91	90
	No	6	2	5	9	10
Do you like to spell	Yes	70	64	75	72	59
	No	30	36	25	28	41
Do you like school?	Yes	87	88	86	95	79
	No	13	12	14	5	21
Do you like language arts?	Yes	76	81	76	79	59
	No	24	19	24	21	41
Do you like social studies?	Yes	71	59	79	70	69
	No	29	41	21	30	31
Do you think you are a high achieving student?	Yes	91	98	86	93	90
	No	9	2	14	7	10
Rate the subjects you like the best (1 is best, 2 is second best, etc.)[b]	Phy. Ed.	1	2	1	2	2
	Math	2	1	3	1	4
	Art	3	3	2	3	3
	Reading	4	4	4	4	5
	Science	5	5	5	5	1
	Music	6	6	6	6	7
	Social Studies	7	7	8	7	6
	Language	8	8	7	8	8

[a] Percentages may not total 100 because of rounding.

[b] Each subject was rank ordered. Physical education was liked best, then math, etc.

Most liked school (87%), math (80%), and science (89%). They like to read (94%), write (82%), and spell (70%). They liked language arts (76%) and social studies (71%). Most (91%) considered themselves high achieving students.

Table 1 also indicates how the students from each program, such as creative writing, differed in their views of school subjects. In the main, few differences existed. All four student groups liked school and their subjects. However, creative writing and social studies high potential students rated their regular social studies subject as one of the least popular with them. Math high potential students rated their regular math subject as the subject they liked best. Science students rated science best. Art rated no lower than third of the eight subjects liked best by all four high potential groups. Art was better liked by all groups than music.

The favorite activity of all four groups was being with friends; however, school was a close second; then came reading a book, playing, watching television and being by themselves.

Most of the students had positive self-images (see Table 2). On a 5-point, semantic differential scale each student was given two bi-polar adjectives to describe himself. The adjectives were:

smart	-	dumb
healthy	-	unhealthy
good	-	bad
superior	-	inferior
successful	-	unsuccessful
happy	-	sad
creative	-	uncreative
leader	-	follower

A rating of 5 was the most positive rating, 3 was neutral and 1 was the most negative. Most of the students (88%) rated themselves as smart (4 or higher rating). The ratings for students with four or higher were as follows: Eighty-eight percent said they were healthy, 83% thought they were good and 86% felt they were successful. Most (91%) were happy and felt they were creative (82%). When asked about their leadership ability, 51% felt they were leaders. Fifty-four percent felt they were superior.

Students in science tended to rate themselves more favorably than the other students. Students in creative writing tended to rate themselves less favorably than the others.

Table 2
Student Self Concept[a]

Rating	I AM:	All Students (N=247)	Creative Writing (N=59)	Social Studies (N=114)	Math (N=44)	Science (N=30)
5	Really Smart	52%	49%	59%	44%	77%
4	Kind of Smart	32	42	24	47	20
3	Neither Smart or Dumb	12	8	17	9	3
2	Kind of Dumb	--	--	--	--	--
1	Really Dumb	--	--	--	--	--
	Mean Rating	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.7
5	Really Healthy	77	64	84	69	83
4	Kind of Healthy	18	27	12	24	10
3	Neither Healthy or Unhealthy	6	8	4	7	7
2	Kind of Unhealthy	--	--	--	--	--
1	Really Unhealthy	--	--	--	--	--
	Mean Rating	4.7	4.6	4.8	4.6	4.8
5	Really Good	54	37	59	52	67
4	Kind of Good	29	42	23	38	13
3	Neither Good or Bad	14	19	15	7	13
2	Kind of Bad	1	2	--	2	3
1	Really Bad	2	--	3	--	3
	Mean Rating	4.3	4.2	4.4	4.4	4.4
5	Really Superior	29	16	30	16	67
4	Kind of Superior	25	29	25	26	13
3	Neither Superior or Inferior	44	48	44	53	20
2	Kind of Inferior	2	3	--	5	--
1	Really Inferior	1	3	1	--	--
	Mean Rating	3.8	3.5	3.8	3.5	4.5
5	Really Successful	58	50	61	50	73
4	Kind of Successful	28	31	25	36	23
3	Neither Successful or Unsuccessful	13	17	14	14	3
2	Kind of Unsuccessful	--	--	--	--	--
1	Really Unsuccessful	--	2	--	--	--
	Mean Rating	4.4	4.3	4.5	4.4	4.7
5	Really Happy	68	58	73	63	77
4	Kind of Happy	23	27	19	30	20
3	Neither Happy or Sad	8	15	7	7	--
2	Kind of Sad	--	--	--	--	--
1	Really Sad	1	--	1	--	3
	Mean Rating	4.6	4.4	4.6	4.6	4.7
5	Really Creative	55	51	59	49	55
4	Kind of Creative	27	29	24	28	31
3	Neither Creative or Uncreative	14	17	12	21	7
2	Kind of Uncreative	3	3	3	2	3
1	Really Uncreative	1	--	2	--	3
	Mean Rating	4.3	4.3	4.4	4.2	4.3
5	Really a Leader	30	19	33	30	40
4	Kind of a Leader	21	19	23	19	23
3	Neither a Leader or Follower	31	36	25	44	20
2	Kind of a Follower	8	14	8	2	3
1	Really a Follower	10	12	10	5	13
	Mean Rating	3.5	3.2	3.6	3.7	3.7
	Grand Mean Rating for all Ratings	4.3	4.1	4.3	4.2	4.5

[a] Percents may not total 100 because of rounding.

The science group mean was 4.5 with 67% of the science students indicating they were really superior. Social studies was the next highest group with a mean of 3.8, but only 30% expressed really superior feelings.

The students are a happy group as a whole. Sixty-eight percent said they were really happy and only 1% said they were unhappy.

The overall mean rating on the eight categories for all students was 4.3. This means, as a whole, they have positive self-images--at least on these aspects of self-image which were studied.

How Were the Students Selected to Participate in the High Potential Program? What Were the Criteria Used to Make the Selections?

In fifty percent of the cases the classroom teacher made the final decision about who would be placed in the program (see Table 3). Ninety-two percent of the teachers made student recommendations. The high potential teacher had the major say in 29% of the selections, 12% were made by committee, 5% by the principal and 4% were made by parents. Personal judgment was the most important criterion used by teachers in making their recommendations. Teachers indicated that the following items were most important to them in making their recommendations. In order of importance they are:

(Number in parentheses indicates the percent of teachers checking the items.)

1. Personal judgment (79%)
2. Outstanding creative performance and/or potential (78%)
3. Demonstrated outstanding academic performance (67%)
4. Pupil products (66%)
5. Available test scores (29%)
6. Other pertinent evidence (23%)
7. Recommendations of others (community, parent, peer, teacher)(19%)

On another set of criteria, teachers listed the following items as being important determiners in their recommendations:

1. Demonstrated intellectual ability (80%)
2. Demonstrated creative or productive thinking (73%)
3. Demonstrated specific academic aptitude (61%)
4. Demonstrated leadership ability (42%)
5. Demonstrated visual and performing arts ability (38%)
6. Demonstrated psychomotor ability (14%)

Seventy-eight percent of the teachers were satisfied with the way students from their classes were chosen for the program. Only 6% were dissatisfied and 17% had no opinion. However, 17% of the teachers indicated there were other

Table 3

Subjects Most Frequently Missed By Students While Attending High Potential Program[a]

Subject	All Students (N=247)	Creative Writing (N=59)	Social Studies (N=114)	Math (N=44)	Science (N=30)
Math	32%	4%	37%	48%	40%
Reading	23	32	29	5	13
Language	11	29	5	9	3
Social Studies	11	11	8	14	20
Phy. Ed.	10	7	11	11	7
Science	5	9	4	2	10
Art	5	5	4	9	7
Music	1	2	--	2	--
Other	1	2	2	--	--

[a]Percents may not total 100 because of rounding.

students more deserving of attending the High Potential Program than the ones from their classes who did attend.

Eighty-nine percent of the teachers indicated they had additional youngsters in their classroom who could benefit from the High Potential Program.

Were the Students Able to Make up the Work They Missed in Their Regular Classroom While Attending the High Potential Program?

Most (74%) of the students indicated they were able to make up missed assignments. Nine percent said they weren't able to and 17% weren't sure. Ninety-three percent of the teachers said the students were able to make up the subjects missed. Three percent of the teachers said the students weren't able to and three percent weren't sure. The subjects most frequently missed are shown in Table 3. Math was the subject most frequently missed. Thirty-two percent of the students cited this as the class most frequently missed, then reading (23%), language (11%), and social studies (11%). Creative writing students missed reading the most, then language. Social studies students missed math the most, then reading; math students missed math the most, then social studies; science students missed math the most, then social studies.

HOW SUCCESSFUL WAS THE HIGH POTENTIAL PROGRAM ACCORDING TO STUDENT VIEWS?

Was the Program Beneficial to the Students?

The students benefited from the program. Sixty-one percent of all of the students said they benefited a great deal and only 4% said they received no benefit (see Table 4). Social studies students indicated that they benefited greatly (68%), math (66%), science (57%) and creative writing (45%).

Did the Students Enjoy the Program?

Ninety percent of the students said they enjoyed the program most or all of the time. Math students enjoyed the program most. Ninety-five percent said they enjoyed it most or all of the time. Creative writing was enjoyed least; however, 85% still enjoyed the program most or all of the time.

Table 4

What do the High Potential Students Think about the Program?[a]

Evaluation Question	Response	All Students (N=247)	Creative Writing (N=59)	Social Studies (N=114)	Math (N=44)	Science (N=30)
Do you feel you benefited from attending the High Potential Program?	Yes, a great deal	61%	45%	68%	66%	57%
	Yes, some	36	47	31	32	40
	No	4	9	2	2	3
Did you enjoy the time you spent in the program?	All of the time	44	39	46	43	47
	Most of the time	46	46	45	52	40
	Some of the time	10	15	10	5	10
	None of the time	--	--	--	--	3
Do you feel your interest in the subject studied in the High Potential Program is now:	Greater than before taking the program	73	71	66	84	83
	About the same as when I entered the program	23	27	27	11	17
	Less than before taking the program	4	2	7	5	--
Would you like to be a student in another High Potential Program?	Yes	61	54	62	59	70
	No	9	14	10	5	7
	Not Sure	30	32	28	36	23
Would you like to see the High Potential Program continue next year?	Yes	80	68	83	91	73
	No	3	3	4	--	3
	Not Sure	17	29	12	9	23
Would you recommend the High Potential Program to a friend?	Yes	73	64	75	73	83
	No	4	7	4	2	3
	Not Sure	23	29	21	25	13
Did your Parent(s) like the program?	Yes	85	71	86	89	100
	No	--	--	--	--	--
	Don't Know	15	29	14	11	--
Does your regular classroom teacher like the High Potential Program?	Yes	51	36	46	68	76
	No	3	9	1	--	3
	Don't Know	46	55	54	32	21

[a] Percents may not total 100 because of rounding

Did the Students' Interest in the Subject Studied Increase as a Result of the High Potential Program?

Table 4 indicates that 73% of the students felt that their interest in the subject studied was greater because of the program. Twenty-three percent indicated it was about the same and four percent said it was less. Math had the largest number (84%) indicating greater interest as a result of the program, then science (83%), creative writing (71%) and social studies (66%). Thus, the High Potential Program heightened interest in each of the four subject areas, according to the student participants.

Would the Students Like to Enroll in Another High Potential Program?

Sixty-one percent would like to enroll again and only 9% said they wouldn't. The rest (30%) weren't sure. Science had the greatest number who would like to enroll again (70%), and creative writing the least (54%).

Would the Students Like to See the High Potential Program Continue Next Year?

Eighty percent of the students would like it to continue next year (1975-76). Math had the most wanting it to continue (91%), and creative writing the least (68%).

Would the Students Recommend the High Potential Program to a Friend?

Seventy-three percent would recommend the High Potential Program to a friend and 4% wouldn't. The rest (23%) weren't sure. Science had the most who would (83%) and creative writing the least (64%).

According to the Students, Did Their Parents Like the Program?

Most of the parents (85%) liked the program, according to the students. Fifteen percent of the students didn't know whether their parents liked the program or not.

According to the Students, Did Their Regular Classroom Teacher Like the High Potential Program?

Fifty-one percent of the students thought that their teacher liked the program, 3% said no, and 46% didn't know.

How Do the Students Compare Their Regular Classroom Subject With the High Potential Program?

Students liked their High Potential Program better than their regular classroom subject on seven different measures (see Table 5). The students were asked to rate their regular classroom subject (such as math) and their high potential subject (such as math) on seven similar evaluative adjectives. A rating of 1 to 5 was given for each pair of adjectives. A 5 rating was the most positive rating possible and a 1 was the worst possible rating.

The High Potential Program was rated higher by the students than their regular classroom subjects on all seven evaluative criteria. Therefore, students liked the High Potential Program better than their comparable regular class subject.

The students also felt the High Potential Program was more challenging. The adjectives "hard" and "easy" were used to discern this. The students rated the High Potential Program harder (2.8) than their regular class (2.5). Of the four groups, math students considered their regular classes the least challenging (2.1) and found the High Potential Math Program the most challenging (3.1). Only the High Potential Creative Writing Program was not as challenging as in the regular classroom subject.

Did the Students Share Anything they Liked About The Program with Their Friends, Teachers, and Class?

Yes--the students shared. Eighty-nine percent shared something about the program with their friends; sixty-four percent shared their high potential experiences with their classroom teacher and 45% shared something with their regular class (see Table 6).

All four of the different High Potential Program students shared their experiences with their friends. Ninety-three percent of the math students shared with their friends, and 75% with their classroom teacher. Social studies students shared the most with their regular class, science the least.

HOW SUCCESSFUL WAS THE HIGH POTENTIAL PROGRAM ACCORDING TO TEACHER VIEWS?

Ninety teachers responded to the teacher questionnaire. Twenty percent had students in creative writing, 20% in math, 12% in science and 48% in social studies. Ninety-one percent understood the purpose of the High Potential Program, 7% weren't sure and 2% didn't know the purpose of the program.

Table 5
How do the Students Compare Their High Potential Program With Their Regular Class?[a]

Evaluative Criteria	All Students (N=247)		Creative Writing (N=59)		Math (N=44)		Social Studies (N=114)		Science (N=30)	
	Regular Class	High Potential	Regular Writing Class	High Potential	Regular Math Class	High Potential	Regular Social Studies Class	High Potential	Regular Science Class	High Potential
Good - Bad	4.2	4.5	4.2	4.4	4.3	4.6	4.1	4.6	4.1	4.4
Interesting - Uninteresting	4.0	4.6	4.0	4.5	3.8	4.6	4.0	4.6	4.0	4.5
Pleasant - Unpleasant	4.2	4.5	4.2	4.3	4.1	4.5	4.2	4.5	4.1	4.4
Hard - Easy	2.5	2.8	2.4	2.3	2.1	3.1	2.7	2.9	2.3	2.9
Satisfactory - Unsatisfactory	4.2	4.5	4.3	4.5	4.3	4.6	4.2	4.5	3.8	4.4
Nice - Awful	4.1	4.5	4.2	4.5	4.2	4.6	4.1	4.5	4.0	4.4
Beautiful - Ugly	3.7	4.1	3.5	4.0	4.1	4.1	3.8	4.2	3.6	3.8
Grand Mean	3.8	4.2	3.8	4.1	3.8	4.3	3.9	4.3	3.7	4.1

[a] Mean ratings are based on the average score for each pair of evaluative criteria. A score of 5.0 is the best possible rating and a score of 1.0 is the lowest possible rating on a 5-point interval scale for each pair of adjectives. Ratings of 5.0 were assigned to the following evaluative criteria: good, interesting, pleasant, hard, satisfactory, nice, and beautiful. Ratings of 1.0 were assigned to: bad, uninteresting, unpleasant, easy, unsatisfactory, awful and ugly.

Table 7 shows what teachers thought about the program. In the main, teachers were very supportive.

Do You Feel that Your Students Benefited From the High Potential Program?

Ninety-one percent of the teachers thought their students benefited and only 3% indicated the program was of little or no value.

Do You Feel the Subject Matter Skills of Your Students Have Increased as a Result of Their Participation in the High Potential Program?

Fifty percent of the teachers felt their students had gained in subject matter skills. There was, however, quite a range of views among the four different High Potential Programs. Eighty percent of the teachers who had students in science thought their students had gained in subject matter skills compared to 35% in creative writing. Math was the second highest with 56%, then social studies with 47%, and creative writing with 35%.

Do Teachers Feel the High Potential Students' Interest in the Subject Increased as a Result of the Program?

Most of the teachers (86%) felt that the students had increased interest in the subject matter as a result of the High Potential Program. All teachers who had students in the math program thought it had increased compared to 71% of the creative writing teachers and 90% of the science teachers.

Do Teachers Recommend the Continuance of the High Potential Program?

Practically all of the teachers (91%) recommended the continuance of the High Potential Program. All teachers who had students in math and science recommended the continuance of the math and science High Potential Program.

Do Teachers Feel There is a Need for Special High Potential Programs Outside Their Classrooms?

Practically all the teachers surveyed (95%) indicated there was a need for special high potential programs outside their own classroom.

Table 6

Did The Students Share Anything They Liked About The Program With Their Friends, Teachers, And Class?[a]

Question	Response	All Students (N=247)	Creative Writing (N=59)	Social Studies (N=114)	Math (N=44)	Science (N=30)
Did you share any of the things you liked about the program with your friends?	Yes	89%	88%	86%	93%	87%
	No	11	12	12	7	13
Did you share any of your high potential experiences with your classroom teacher?	Yes	64	54	64	75	70
	No	36	46	36	25	30
Did you share any of your high potential class experiences with your regular class?	Yes	45	32	59	39	30
	No	55	68	41	61	70

[a]Percents may not total 100 because of rounding

Table 7

How Successful was the Program According to Teacher Views[a]

Question	Response	All Teachers (N=90)	Creative Writing (N=18)	Social Studies (N=48)	Math (N=18)	Science (N=11)
Do you feel that your students (those in your class) benefited from the High Potential Program?	Yes, they benefited alot	50%	59%	36%	59%	80%
	Yes, they benefited	41	24	55	41	10
	It was of some benefit	6	18	2	--	10
	It was of little or no benefit	3	--	7	--	--
Do you feel the subject matter skills of your students have increased as a result of their attendance in the High Potential Program?	Yes	50	35	47	56	80
	No	14	12	19	11	--
	Not Sure	36	53	35	33	20
Do you feel the high potential student's interest in the subject studies:	Increased as a result of the High Potential Program	86	71	84	100	90
	Decreased as a result of the program	--	--	--	--	--
	Remained about the same as always	14	29	16	--	10
Would you recommend the continuance of the High Potential Program?	Yes	91	100	84	94	100
	No	1	--	2	--	--
	Yes, but with the following changes	8	--	14	6	--
Do you feel there is a need for special high potential programs outside your classroom?	Yes	95	94	93	100	100
	No	1	--	2	--	--
	Not Sure	3	6	5	--	--
Do you personally have a greater interest in high potential students now than previously?	Yes	26	44	21	17	30
	No	22	19	24	28	10
	About the same	52	38	55	56	60

Table 7 (continued)

How Successful was the Program According to Teacher Views[a]

Question	Response	All Teachers (N=90)	Creative Writing (N=18)	Social Studies (N=48)	Math (N=18)	Science (N=11)
Do you feel you could have done as good of a job with the students by keeping them in your class as by sending them to the High Potential Program?	Yes	7%	--	15%	--	--
	No	81	71	83	89	80
	Not Certain	12	29	3	11	20
Do you feel you were kept informed about what was going on in the High Potential Program	Yes	48	44	59	11	80
	No	52	56	41	89	20
Would you like to receive in-service training in the area of high potential children in your classroom?	Yes	60	50	56	69	80
	No	40	50	44	31	20
Did the high potential students share any of their experiences with your class?	Yes	53	21	63	35	89
	No	47	79	37	65	11

[a]Percents may not total 100 because of rounding

Do Teachers Feel They Personally Have a Greater Interest in High Potential Students as a Result of the Program?

Most of the teachers (74%) did not become more interested in high potential students as a result of the program. However, 26% said their interest had increased. Teachers with students in creative writing had the greatest increase (44%) and math had the lowest percentage expressing more interest (17%).

Do Teachers Feel They Could Have Done as Good a Job With the Students by Keeping Them in Their Classes as by Sending Them to the High Potential Program?

Most of the teachers (81%) felt the High Potential Program was better able to do the job with the students than could be done by keeping them in their regular class.

Do Teachers Want to Receive In-service Training in the Area of High Potential Children in Their Classroom?

A majority of the teachers (60%) surveyed would like to receive in-service training. Those teachers who had students in science (80%) and math (69%) had the largest percentages desiring training, but social studies had 56% and creative writing had 50%.

Were Teachers Kept Informed About What was Going on in the High Potential Programs? Did the Students Share Any of Their Experiences With the Teachers' Classes?

Forty-eight percent of the teachers indicated they were kept informed about what was going on in the High Potential Program. Wide variations occurred in this area among the four high potential subject areas. For example, 80% of the teachers who had students in the science program felt they were kept informed compared to only 11% of the teachers who had students in the math program.

Wide variations also existed among teachers who said their high potential students shared their experiences with their class. Fifty-three percent of the teachers indicated that the high potential students shared their high potential experiences with their class. However, among individual subject areas, science again had the greatest amount of sharing (89%) then social studies (63%), math (35%), and creative writing (21%) the least sharing. The better informed the teachers were about the program the better chances there

were that students were allowed to share their experiences with their regular class.

Forty-eight percent of the teachers felt there was satisfactory communication between them and the high potential teacher (see Appendix for teacher questionnaire item number 44). Also, 42% of the teachers indicated they had the opportunity to learn about the High Potential Program from the high potential teacher. Only 26% of the teachers had the opportunity to exchange ideas with the high potential teacher.

Which High Potential Class Schedule Do Teachers Prefer?

Teachers were given three class schedules to choose from. They also could suggest their own. The three schedules were:

1. One-half day per week for 24 weeks
2. Two half-days per week for 12 weeks
3. Four half-days per week for 6 weeks

Table 8 shows the teachers views on class schedule preferences. There was no clear-cut opinion among teachers. However, it is clear that teachers with students in math preferred the one-half day per week for 24 weeks (94%). Teachers with science students prefer the two half-days per week for 12 weeks (89%). Four half-days a week for six weeks was the most popular with those teachers having students in creative writing (50%) and social studies (56%).

Which Subjects Should Have Priority in the High Potential Program?

Teachers felt that the most important subject for a High Potential Program was math first, then science and language arts (see teacher questionnaire in Appendix).

HOW SUCCESSFUL WAS THE HIGH POTENTIAL PROGRAM ACCORDING TO PARENT VIEWS?

Parents were very happy with the program. Seventy-two parents randomly selected were interviewed by telephone about the High Potential Program (see Parent Telephone Interview form in Appendix). Twenty-one parents who had students in math were interviewed, 10 science parents, 29 social studies and 12 parents in creative writing were interviewed. Ninety percent were mothers,

Table 8

Which High Potential Class Schedule Do Teachers Prefer[a]

Class Schedule	All Teachers (N=90)	Creative Writing (N-18)	Social Studies (N=43)	Math (N=18)	Science (N=11)
One-half day a week for 24 weeks	28%	19%	8%	94%	11%
Two-half days a week for 12 weeks	30	31	26	6	89
Four-half days a week for 6 weeks	37	50	56	--	--
Other	5	--	10	--	--

[a]Percents may not total 100 because of rounding

eight percent were fathers and one percent were others. Thirty-four percent had visited the program.

Nearly all (99%) of the parents liked the program their child was enrolled in and said that their child had benefited from the program.

Most parents (98%) liked the program and would like to have their child enrolled in a similar program again. Practically all (98%) of the parents thought their children were able to make up satisfactorily the work missed during their absence from the regular classroom.

The following comments were made by the parents about the program:

Was There Anything You Particularly Liked About the Program?

- Kept him interested in school. It was a challenge for him which he had never had before.
- Introduced new things.
- The exposure to technology.
- The children got an intellectual exercise. A challenging experience.
- The creativity, development of interest. The fun of learning.
- Teacher was great with children! Very stimulating. Helped build child's ego!
- Gave daughter a means and form to show expression.
- Teacher was wonderful.
- Felt that it was an enrichment program.
- The idea that they actually were doing high level writing.
- Give kids who are able special opportunities.
- Seeing excitement brought to her son.
- The fact that the math he was doing was on a higher level and the computer work they were doing.
- Working with the project.
- The teacher and her casual way with the children.
- The people using their own creativity.
- Just that it was extra for the children and the ballet they saw.
- Gave her a variety of subjects.
- The teacher was excellent.
- All very good.
- The papers they had to write.
- He learned so much.
- It was a good introduction to Spanish culture.
- That Stan Kiesel is such a delight! He expanded the childrens' minds.

- Nothing, haven't met teacher.
- Its approach and originality.
- Made her more interested in learning things--reads more.
- Thought it gave her more self-confidence.
- The idea that they were doing creative writing.
- Took place during the school day.
- The fact that he was able to do some creative writing.
- The teacher has a way of working with these children!
- Gave kids an opportunity to work with new ideas!
- The games.
- The teacher has a way of working with these children!
- In general it was very good.
- How the children were on their own.
- Kids were enthusiastic.
- The whole thing was very well organized.
- Teacher seemed very concerned!
- Liked degree of sophistication. Level of learning was most impressive.
- Noticed that the lab was well equipped. Quite impressed with childrens' ability to work with the program.
- The whole thing! Children got a lot out of the program.
- Overall, the kids were all interested.
- The whole in general was very good.
- Enjoyed the fact that she liked the manner in which the children were being taught.
- Learning a new language.
- Liked the idea that children are given the opportunity to do this.
- Liked the structure and the language. The teacher was fantastic!
- Appreciated the fact the cultures of the language was included besides just learning to speak the language.
- It provided things for him that were different for his ability!
- Good for him to progress.
- The whole thing.
- Be able to make choices; tremendous rapport between son and teacher! Very rich experience!
- Just the way it was done! Gave good perspective.

Was there Anything You Particularly Disliked About the Program?

- The initial vagueness.
- Should be expanded to include more children.
- At the open house the parents were unable to bring small children and the time was inconvenient.
- After being accepted into the class, they dropped a few students because of overcrowdedness; felt that it was hard on the children.
- Heavy curricular for child. Would rather see smaller projects for children.
- The few children that were chosen to get out of the teacher's hair!
- Interfered with other classes.
- Only that because of moving, had to leave the program.
- Strange; nothing to benefit from. Stupid!
- Not yet.
- Only that I didn't have a chance to visit the class.
- Could have been a longer class.
- Would like to see this program year around for all students and perhaps for the high potential children an enrichment class. Did not care for the modular type effect it had.
- This should be a choice.
- The grading or the teachers way of grading.
- Nothing, other than red tape hassels.
- No! Only wish that it was a longer program. Was four days and had to drop to two days because class was too large.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Minneapolis Public Schools High Potential Program for gifted elementary children in grades 4-6 began December 2, 1974 and extended through June 6, 1975. Twenty-one schools and approximately 353 students participated. Programs in math, science, social studies-modern languages and creative writing were offered.

How successful was the program? Very successful according to the views of students, parents of the students, and teachers of the students. The following were the main findings:

1. Sixty-one percent of the students surveyed said they benefited a great deal and only 4% said they received no benefit. Most teachers (91%) thought their students benefited and only 3% indicated the program was of little value. Practically all of the parents (99%) said their children benefited.

2. Most of the students (90%) enjoyed the program.
3. Seventy-three percent of the students felt their interest in the subject studied was greater because of the program. Most of the teachers (86%) felt that the students interest increased as a result of the program.
4. Nearly all the parents (99%) liked the program. Most (98%) would like to see it continue. Most students (80%) would like to see it continue. Nearly all the teachers (91%) recommended the continuance of the program.
5. Practically all the teachers (95%) indicated there was a need for special high potential programs outside their classroom. Most of the teachers (81%) felt they could not do as good a job with the students as the teachers in the High Potential Program could.
6. Fifty percent of the teachers felt their students had gained in subject matter skills. Eighty percent of the teachers who had students in the science program felt their students had gained in subject matter skills; math was second with 56%, then social studies (47%) and creative writing (35%).
7. The High Potential Program was liked better by the students than their comparable regular classroom subject.
8. The High Potential Program was more challenging to the students than their regular classroom subject with the exception of creative writing which was slightly less challenging.
9. Most students (73%) would recommend the High Potential Program to a friend.
10. In the main, most students (74%) were able to make up the classroom work they missed while attending the High Potential Program. Nine percent of the students weren't able to and 17% weren't sure. Ninety-three percent of the teachers said the students were able to make up the subjects missed. Three percent of the teachers said the students weren't able to and three percent weren't sure. Practically all (98%) of the parents thought their children could make up satisfactorily the work missed.

Recommendations

1. Continue the program. That is the wish of parents, teachers and students. However, this is one view, one evaluation of the program. No attempt was made to examine cost effectiveness, alternative programs, and relative effects.
2. Consider an in-service training program for teachers. Sixty percent indicated an interest in receiving in-service training in the area of high potential children in their classroom. Teachers who had students in the science program expressed the greatest interest; then math, social studies and creative writing teachers in that order.
3. Priorities established for high potential programs should be math first, then science and language arts. That is the opinion of the teachers surveyed. Again no consideration was given to cost effectiveness.
4. Greater emphasis should be placed on creating better communication between classroom teacher and high potential teacher. Classroom teachers that are best informed about what is going on tend to allow their high potential students more opportunity to share their high potential experience in their classroom. Teachers with students in the High Potential Science Program (80%) were the best informed and teachers of High Potential Math Students (11%) were the least informed.

APPENDIX

Minneapolis Public Schools
STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

N=247

All Students

All responses to items on this questionnaire will be confidential. There are no right or wrong answers. Please answer each question the best you can. Do not put your name on this sheet.

(1-2) ___ My school is: _____

(3) I am:

54% 1. A boy
46 2. A girl

(4) I am in:

- 1. The third grade
25% 2. The fourth grade
34 3. The fifth grade
40 4. The sixth grade
- 5. The seventh grade

(5) My race is:

4% 1. Black
92 2. White
3 3. Other

(6) Which program did you participate in?

24% 1. Creative Writing
18 2. Math
12 3. Science
46 4. Spanish-Social Studies

(7) Which would you rather do (check one only)?

18% 1. Read a book
8 2. Watch television
23 3. Go to school
10 4. Play
38 5. Be with friends
3 6. Be by yourself

(8) Please rate the three subjects you like best. Put a 1 by your favorite, 2 by your next favorite, and 3 by your 3rd favorite subject.

2 1. Math
4 2. Reading
5 3. Science
8 4. Language
7 5. Social Studies
1 6. Phy. Ed.
6 7. Music
3 8. Art

(9) Which subject were you absent from most while attending the high potential program (check one only)?

23% 1. Reading
32 2. Math
11 3. Language
11 4. Social Studies
5 5. Science
10 6. Phy. Ed.
1 7. Music
5 8. Art
1 9. Other _____

(10) Do you feel you benefited from attending the high potential program?

61% 1. Yes, a great deal
36 2. Yes, some
4 3. No

(11) Did you enjoy the time you spent in the program?

44% 1. All of the time
46 2. Most of the time
10 3. Some of the time
- 4. None of the time

(12) Did your parent(s) like the program?

85% 1. Yes
- 2. No
15 3. Don't know

(13) Would you like to see the high potential program continue next year?

80% 1. Yes
3 2. No
17 3. Not sure

(14) Would you recommend the high potential program to a friend?

73% 1. Yes
4 2. No
23 3. Not sure

(15) Would you like to be a student in another high potential program?

61% 1. Yes
9 2. No
30 3. Not sure

(16) Do you feel your interest in the subject studied in the high potential program is now:

73% 1. Greater than before taking the program.
23 2. About the same as when I entered the program.
4 3. Less than before taking the program.

(17) In the main, do you think you were able to make-up the class work you missed while attending the high potential program?

74% 1. Yes
9 2. No
17 3. Not sure

(18) Did you share any of the things you liked about the program with your friends?

89% 1. Yes
11 2. No

(19) Did you share any of your high potential experiences with your classroom teacher?

64% 1. Yes
36 2. No

(20) Did you share any of your high potential class experiences with your regular class?

45% 1. Yes
55 2. No

(21) Does your regular classroom teacher like the high potential program?

51% 1. Yes
3 2. No
46 3. Don't know

(22) Do you like to take tests?

65% 1. Yes
35 2. No

(23) Do you like math?

80% 1. Yes
20 2. No

(24) Do you like science?

89% 1. Yes
18 2. No

(25) Do you like to write?

82% 1. Yes
18 2. No

(26) Do you like to read?

94% 1. Yes
6 2. No

(27) Do you like to spell?

70% 1. Yes
30 2. No

(28) Do you like school?

87% 1. Yes
13 2. No

(29) Do you like language arts?

76% 1. Yes
24 2. No

(30) Do you like social studies?

71% 1. Yes
29 2. No

(31) Do you think you are a high achieving student?

91% 1. Yes
9 2. No

Place a check (✓) in the blank closest to how you feel.

THE HIGH POTENTIAL PROGRAM WAS (IS):

Mean							
4.5	(32)	Good	70%	18%	8%	2%	1%	Bad
4.6	(33)	Interesting	74	16	6	2	2	Uninteresting
4.5	(34)	Unpleasant	2	2	10	21	65	Pleasant
3.2	(35)	Hard	8	13	48	13	18	Easy
4.5	(36)	Satisfactory	67	20	11	-	2	Unsatisfactory
4.5	(37)	Nice	67	19	11	1	1	Awful
4.1	(38)	Ugly	2	2	27	26	44	Beautiful

I AM

4.4	(39)	Smart	56%	32%	12%	-	-	Dumb
4.7	(40)	Healthy	77	18	6	-	-	Unhealthy
4.3	(41)	Bad	2	1	14	29	54	Good
3.8	(42)	Superior	29	25	44	2	1	Inferior
4.4	(43)	Successful	58	28	13	-	-	Unsuccessful
4.6	(44)	Sad	1	-	8	23	68	Happy
4.3	(45)	Creative	55	27	14	3	1	Uncreative
3.5	(46)	Follower	10	8	31	21	30	Leader

MY REGULAR		MATH	SCIENCE	WRITING	SOCIAL STUDIES		SUBJECT IS:
4.2	(47)	Good	53%	22%	18%	5%	2%	Bad
4.0	(48)	Uninteresting	7	6	16	24	46	Interesting
4.2	(49)	Pleasant	52	26	13	4	5	Unpleasant
3.5	(50)	Hard	6	10	36	20	28	Easy
4.2	(51)	Satisfactory	52	25	16	3	4	Unsatisfactory
4.1	(52)	Nice	47	29	18	3	3	Awful
3.7	(53)	Ugly	3	4	35	30	27	Beautiful

WHAT DID YOU LIKE BEST ABOUT THE HIGH POTENTIAL PROGRAM?

WHAT DID YOU LIKE LEAST ABOUT THE HIGH POTENTIAL PROGRAM?

Comments were not included in this report because of their volume. Readers who are interested should call the Research Department and a summary copy will be sent.

All Teachers N=90

Minneapolis Public Schools
TEACHER HIGH POTENTIAL PROGRAM QUESTIONNAIRE

Please do not sign this questionnaire as all responses are intended to be anonymous. There are no right or wrong answers.

(1-2) ____ What school do you teach in? _____

(3) Please indicate the high potential program subject area that your student(s) participated in.

20% 1. Creative Writing
20 2. Math
12 3. Science
48 4. Spanish-Social Studies

(4) Do you understand the purpose of the high potential program?

91% 1. Yes
2 2. No
7 3. Not sure

(5) How many of your students were (are) enrolled in the high potential program?

1. 28 2. 19 3. 16 4. 14 5. 6 6. 1 7. 3

(6) Did you personally recommend a student for inclusion in the program?

8% 1. No (If no, skip to item #30)
92 2. Yes (If yes proceed to next question #7)

Please check the items you considered in making your recommendation(s) (check as many as apply).

Percent		Freq.	
29%	(7)	26	Available test scores
66	(8)	59	Pupil products
78	(9)	70	Outstanding creative performance and/or potential
67	(10)	60	Demonstrated outstanding academic performance
79	(11)	71	My personal judgment
19	(12)	17	Recommendations of others (Community, parent, peer, teacher)
23	(13)	21	Other pertinent evidence

Please check the item(s) you considered when making your recommendation (If demonstrated high performance check the left side, if suspected high potential check the right side). You may check both sides.

Demonstrated		Freq.		Potential		Freq.
80%	(14)	72	General intellectual ability	38%	(21)	34
61	(15)	55	Specific academic aptitude	33	(22)	30
73	(16)	66	Creative or productive thinking	43	(23)	39
42	(17)	38	Leadership ability	28	(24)	25
38	(18)	34	Visual and Performing Arts avility	26	(25)	23
14	(19)	13	Psychomotor ability	9	(26)	8
8	(20)	7	Other _____	1	(27)	1

(28) Was there a committee assigned to review all pertinent data about the student before placement into the program?

7% 1. Yes
80 2. No
12 3. Don't know

35

(29) Who made the final decision about who would be placed in the program (check one only)?

50% 1. Myself
5 2. Principal
4 3. Parent
12 4. Committee (If committee what was the composition?)

_____

_____

29 5. Other (describe)

_____

(30) Were you satisfied with the way students from your class were chosen for the program?

78% 1. Yes
6 2. No
17 3. Not sure

Comments: _____

_____

(31) Were there other students in your class more deserving of attending the high potential program than the ones from your class who attended?

17% 1. Yes
60 2. No
24 3. Not sure

(32) Do you have additional youngsters in your classroom who could benefit from the high potential program?

11% 1. No
89 2. Yes (If yes, how many _____?)

(33) Did (are) your high potential student(s) missing any important aspects of their instructional program because of their absence from your class to attend the high potential program?

75% 1. No
25 2. Yes (If yes, what?)_____

_____

(34) Which subjects were your student(s) absent from most while attending the high potential program (check one only)?

____1. Reading
____2. Math
____3. Language
____4. Social Studies
____5. Science
____6. Phy. Ed.
____7. Music
____8. Art
____9. Other

(35) In the main, do you think the students from your class were able to make-up the subjects they missed?

93% 1. Yes
3 2. No
3 3. Not sure

Comments: _____

_____

(36) Do you feel that your students (those in your class) benefited from the high potential program?

50% 1. Yes, they benefited a lot
41 2. Yes, they benefited
6 3. It was of some benefit to them
3 4. It was of little or no benefit to them

(37) Do you feel the subject matter skills of your students (those attending the high potential class) have been increased as a result of their attendance in the high potential program?

50% 1. Yes
14 2. No
36 3. Not sure

(38) Do you feel the high potential student's interest in the subject matter studied:

86% 1. Increased as a result of the high potential program
- 2. Decreased as a result of the program
14 3. Remained about the same as always

(39) Do you feel you could have done as good a job with the students by keeping them in your class as by sending them to the high potential program?

7% 1. Yes
81 2. No
12 3. Not certain

(40) Would you recommend the continuance of the high potential program?

91% 1. Yes
1 2. No
8 3. Yes, but with the following changes: _____

(41) Do you feel there is a need for special high potential programs outside your classroom?

95% 1. Yes
1 2. No
3 3. Not sure

(42) Do you personally have a greater interest in high potential students now than previously?

26% 1. Yes
22 2. No
52 3. About the same

(43) Did you feel you were kept informed about what was going on in the high potential class?

48% 1. Yes
52 2. No

Please check as many as apply to your situation:

Percent		Freq.	
48%	(44)	43	There was satisfactory communication between the high potential teacher and me.
42	(45)	38	I had the opportunity to learn about the high potential program from the high potential teacher.
26	(46)	23	I had the opportunity to exchange ideas with the high potential teacher.

(47) Would you like to receive inservice training in the area of high potential children in your classroom?

60% 1. Yes
40 2. No

(48) Did the high potential students share any of their experiences with your class?

53% 1. Yes
47 2. No

(49) Three different class schedules for the high potential program were offered. Which do you prefer:

28% 1. One half day per week for 24 weeks
30 2. Two half days a week for 12 weeks
37 3. Four half days per week for 6 weeks
5 4. Other (Please list) _____

(50) Please list other subject areas that should have a high potential program. List in order of preference:

Math 1 Science 2 Language Arts 3

(51) What one idea from the high potential program did you learn that you thought you could use in your classroom?

(52) What feature(s) did you like best about the high potential program?

Comments were not included in this report because of their volume. Readers who are interested should call the Research Department and a summary copy will be sent.

(53) What feature(s) did you like least about the high potential program?

Thank you for completing this questionnaire.

Research and Evaluation Dept.

N=72

High Potential Parent
Telephone Interview

Hello _____ my name is _____ I work for the Minneapolis Public School Research Department.

_____ recently attended or is now attending a special program for gifted or high potential children. Are you familiar with it? Minneapolis Public Schools are interested in knowing what you think about the program. We would like to ask you several questions, and will not tell anyone what your responses are. We are only interested in reporting what a group of parents think--not individuals. Therefore what you say will be kept in complete confidence.

(1-2) _____ School _____

(3) Program

29% 1. Math

14 2. Science

40 3. Spanish

17 4. Creative Writing

(4) Parent

8% 1. Father

90 2. Mother

1 3. Other

(5) Did YES=99% NO=1% like the program?
student name

(6) In your opinion, did he/she benefit from the program?

99% 1. Yes

1 2. No

(7) Would you like to have him/her enrolled in a similar program next year?

98% 1. Yes

2 2. No

(8) Did you like the program?

98% 1. Yes

2 2. No

(9) Do you think he/she was able to make-up satisfactorily the work missed during his/her absence from the regular classroom?

98% 1. Yes

? 2. No

(10) Have you visited the program?

34% 1. Yes

66 2. No